

# Business and Facilities Planning Council

October 13, 2015

9:00am – 11:00am

ST-107

## Meeting Minutes

**Present:** Beth Gomez (Admin Tri-Chair), Phu Tran (Faculty Tri-Chair), Dan Lambros (Staff Tri-Chair), Diane Dieckmeyer, Richard Henry, Shirley McGraw, Steve Monsanto, Damon Nance, Gustavo Ocegüera, Erin Power, Jim Thomas, Koji Uesugi, Mark Hartley (Guest), Kevin Fleming (Guest), Christian Castillo (Guest)

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.
- II. Approval of meeting minutes from September 8, 2015 MSC (Gustavo/Nance) Approved.  
2 abstentions (Tran, Uesugi)
- III. A motion was made to move agenda item III a. Norco Marquee to IV4b MSC (Thomas/Uesugi) Approved.
- IV. Information Items
  - a. New Business
    - i. Carl D. Perkins Funds - Dr. Kevin Fleming

Dr. Fleming provided the committee with a brief history on Carl D Perkins Grant with an explanation on how the funds are used to expand, not maintain programs. Dr. Fleming reviewed the handouts showing the data gathered and how it is used for planning. Perkins funding is funneled through the district, and is distributed amongst the colleges; the funding fluctuates every year depending on headcount. CTE numbers have grown over the years because of the gaming program. Dr. Fleming shared upcoming rule changes and answered questions on how funds are awarded at the college level. This is an annual process each spring, plans due early march, committee reviews March/April, meets in May to make final determination. The committee requested a Perkins update be added to the committee planning calendar for an update each fall.

- ii. first cloud based software, Microsoft 365. This software will allow more access from anywhere and any device. Some challenges are the ability to access archived emails past 30 days. It is recommended that emails be backed up regularly to an external hard drive. Technology Services will need to upload the software on each

desktop. It was suggested that techs check the status of the email archive at the same time. Training will be offered as soon as there is more information. A group of super users will be established to immediately pilot the program to become familiar with it and be able to offer assistance to staff within their departments once the program is rolled out college-wide. Updates will be provided as more information becomes available. A recommendation was made to defer college-wide conversion until after the winter intersession. Please forward questions or concerns to Shirley McGraw.

iv. Rubric – Beth Gomez

This is to continue the discussion for the revision of the rubric used to rank program review requests. We hope to finalize the changes by December, move forward through the approval process for use in the next program review cycle. Last spring we talked about changing the rubric to improve the tie to student learning. Everything we do supports student learning, so we moved the yes or no question to the top. For long range goals, we wanted more room to compete for the points. We still need to discuss the criteria for efficiency and innovation. Everything listed above the line is the core, the rest are the bonus points and provide an opportunity to garner more points. Dr. Dieckmeyer relayed that one thing requested in the new standards is to have a stronger emphasis on the mission and now program review is linked to the mission of the college. In the lower section, alignment with the mission is broken out by 'emerging technology', we need a link in the rubric in a clear way that this is a consideration in our planning processes. Correct under safety change to "does not". We also need to include more information on regulatory compliance, define and make it clear. If we use that criteria we have to be specific about what that means, nail down some definitions that would scrutinize that category or we say that it does not fit in the rubric. We need to define criteria for the differences in operational costs and what is considered strategic. Possibly changing the verbiage by calling it augmentations rather than more operational budgets. Dr. Ocegvera requested to work out how grants fits into it, if there is a need for the grant that is not allowable, we need to figure out a way to give them proper consideration.

v. Program Review

We need to schedule at least two meetings within the next month and half to prioritize the administrative program review requests. Calendar invitations will be sent out in the coming week.

vi. Budget Update – We added a column that specifies Norco College allocation for the committee information and to bring forward to ISPC. It was requested to break out SS and Student Equity and Instructional and deferred maintenance.

State Mandate Block Grant \$15M is for anything we are bound to do by law that we don't get money for i.e. collective bargaining, brown act compliance, etc. The district is holding on to offset because for years we were not getting any money, in the old days the state would give money for mandates, they stopped doing that, these are funds used to offset that bill that was accruing, legislation stipulates that the state reimburse district.

BAM Revenue piece shows a shortfall. While it is not palatable to cut MVC 1.2M to make Norco and RCC whole; it is also not good practice to devalue FTES at Norco. It was noted that grants were not considered in the calculations. Beth is advocating to break out every single piece of the BAM, District funding cannot be taken off the top, the process must be transparent and approved by t